



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

SW

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/080,375	02/19/2002	David A. Hanson	6683.52USU1	6839
23552	7590	12/23/2004		
MERCHANT & GOULD PC P.O. BOX 2903 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903			EXAMINER ROBERT, EDUARDO C	
			ART UNIT 3732	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 12/23/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/624,735	WHITMORE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	David Comstock	3732	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) David Comstock. (3) Todd Overholt.
 (2) Aaron Borrowman. (4) Mike Feay
 (5) Todd Diamond.

Date of Interview: 17 December 2004.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-11.

Identification of prior art discussed: Okada et al. (4,323,326).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.


Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.


EDUARDO C. ROBERT
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant argued that Okada et al. does not disclose a flat cutting tip, a double-lead thread from tip to head, and a variable pitched thread. Examiner disagreed, relying on open claim language merely requiring "a" flat cutting edge (e.g., 8 in Fig. 1B of Okada et al.). Examiner noted that the argued limitations "non-conical, non-tapering with no conical angle" are not found in the present claims. Furthermore, Okada et al. discloses that the screw may comprise single or double threads. Several figures and embodiments appear to show double threads along their entire length. In addition, at least Figs. 1A and 5 of Okada et al., as well as, e.g., col. 1, lines 34-39, referring to "lead angle," appear to disclose a multi-pitched thread.